

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Director of Personnel

18 JUN 1957

Director of Training

Junior Officer Training Program

Reference: Your memorandum on same subject dated 5 June 1957

1. I agree with and support the general statements which have been made in this memorandum. The principles outlined in Paragraphs 2 and 5 are constructive developments which I welcome.

2. The time periods noted in Paragraph 3 represent what we consider to be minimum after EOD which would qualify an individual for the work of his office if he were appropriately placed at the completion of his basic training. Normally, we have not been transferring individuals at such early dates largely because the divisions have requested longer on-the-desk training periods. We hope to reduce these times to those indicated in your memorandum, and I believe that as we develop more structured on-the-desk training programs, we will be able to accomplish this result.

3. In the past, practices for sending JOT's overseas have varied. Recently, we have adopted the principle (noted in Paragraph 4 of your memorandum) that before overseas assignment, JOT will be transferred to the table of organization of the using component. This is largely because we do not now have authorization for overseas slots for the JOT's. It is my hope, however, that as we become better able to judge the potential of these JOT's, we will be able to give them training overseas as well as at Headquarters. Only recently, we have been discussing the possibility of developing a training program for a small number of specially qualified JOT's. While in principle, I believe that the ordinary JOT should be transferred before going to the field, I would not like to exclude the possibility of overseas training programs for the future.

4. Of particular importance is the question of how best to give our JOT's the language competence necessary for their ultimate development into top-notch individuals. Although from time to time we have successfully developed intensive language and area programs (of two years or more duration) for these newcomers, I feel it is not in the best interests of the Program or the Agency to cultivate this approach too vigorously. One reason for this stand is my belief that with these young people who may easily shift from intelligence to a business or

JOB NO. BOX NO. FLD NO. DOC NO. NO CHANGE  
IN CLASS/DECLASS/CLASS CHANGES: IS S C REA. JUST. 22  
NEXT REV DATE 27 NOV 1957 REVIEWER 35932 TYPE DOC. 02  
NO. PCS 4 CREATION DATE - ORG COMPO/ OPI 30 ORG CLASS C  
REV CLASS C REV COORD. - AUTH: HR 703

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

57/TR-1-2431

**CONFIDENTIAL**

academic degree, we should take every opportunity to cultivate their interest in intelligence as such by giving them as much depth in our work as possible. I prefer, therefore, to give them only such language training before going overseas as is necessary to make it possible for them to pick it up readily once in a foreign country. The second reason for not providing intensive language training early in a man's career is the difficulty of deciding which country he should go to and therefore which language he should be equipped with. All in all, I feel it is better to wait until his interests crystallize. I should therefore like to combine this problem with the suggestion you make in Paragraph 5 so that we might review the cases of all present or former JOF's who have gone overseas with the view of continuing them in the JOF Program if they deserve to be given intensive language training.

SIGNED

MATTHEW BAIRD

**CONFIDENTIAL**

NOT BOOK

2001 12 5 13 04 23

CONFIDENTIAL